

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 17 have been rejected as being anticipated by Anderson.

Claim 1 sets forth a plurality of telephone units where at least one of the telephone units has a display. Claim 1 also sets forth a device for monitoring the calls and to provide data to the display showing conference call participant information with regard to telephone units participating in the conference call. Applicant has reviewed Anderson, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of such a monitoring device in Anderson.

The rejection states that Anderson describes a display, in particular the LCD of I/O devices 15. The rejection states that Anderson also describes the monitoring device of claim 1 in column 5, lines 33-55. Applicant has reviewed this portion of Anderson, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of any monitoring device in this portion of Anderson which provides data to a display for showing conference call participant information. This portion of Anderson describes a list of participants, but Applicant does not find any device for sending this list of participants to a display. Instead it appears that this list is only used to generate a unicast packet for each of the telephone sets on the list of participants, column 5 lines 38-40. Since there is no structure described in this portion of Anderson for providing data to a display, this portion of Anderson cannot anticipate the monitoring device of claim 1. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of any other structure in Anderson similar to the monitoring device of claim 1. Therefore the monitoring device of claim 1 causes claim 1 not to be anticipated by Anderson.

Claim 1 also sets forth an input device associated with the display for selecting any of

the telephone units from the conference call participating information. Applicant has reviewed Anderson, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of this input device in Anderson. The rejection indicates that this input device is described in Anderson in column 5, lines 33-55. As Applicant has described above, Applicant does not describe a display which displays participant information. Therefore it is quite clear that Anderson cannot describe an input device associated with such a display. Furthermore, Anderson cannot describe an input device which selects any of the telephone units from the conference call participant information since Anderson does not have a display which shows conference call participant information. Since there is no such display or participant information, Anderson cannot describe an input device which selects a telephone unit from such participant information. The input device of claim 1 therefore is not anticipated by Anderson, and further causes claim 1 to define over Anderson.

Claim 1 also sets forth that the input device drops the selected telephone unit from the conference call. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of any structure in Anderson which drops a selected telephone unit from a conference call. This is especially true when the telephone unit that is dropped is one selected by an input device associated with a display. Applicant has reviewed Anderson, and while Anderson describes conference calls, and a list of participants of the conference call, Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of any structure in Anderson which would drop a telephone unit or participant from a conference call. Therefore the input device of claim 1 further causes claim 1 to define over Anderson.

Applicant notes that Anderson does describe removing conference call identifiers from table 72 when the conference call ends. However Anderson does not describe any structure

for actually ending the conference call, and certainly does not describe an input device associated with the display for selecting a telephone unit and then dropping that telephone unit from the conference call.

Independent claim 8 sets forth an input device connected to or associated with a display. The display is then set forth as displaying all or part of a list which corresponds to an identity of each source of packets combined by a packet controller. Applicant has reviewed Anderson, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of a display which displays all or part of a list of identities of combined packets. The rejection appears to indicate that this is described in Anderson in column 5, lines 33-55. Applicant has reviewed this portion and finds no teaching nor suggestion of a display displaying a list of combined packets. Since Anderson does not describe a display displaying a list of combined packets, Anderson cannot anticipate the display of claim 8. Claim 8 therefore defines over Anderson.

Claim 8 also sets forth that the input device is connected with the display whereby an identity may be selected. Since Anderson does not teach nor suggest a display providing a list of identities, Anderson clearly cannot describe an input device associated with a display where an identity displayed on the display may be selected. Therefore the input device of claim 8 cannot be anticipated by Anderson. Claim 8 therefore further defines over Anderson.

Claim 8 further sets forth that the input device selects an identity for dropping a participant from the conference call. As described above, Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion in Anderson of any structure for selecting a participant to be dropped from a conference call. Claim 8 therefore further defines over Anderson.

Independent claim 16 sets forth a telephone conference call process including the step of forming a list of telecommunication devices participating in a concurrent telephonic communication, and displaying all or part of that list. Applicant has reviewed Anderson, and finds no teaching nor suggestion in Anderson of any step of displaying all or part of a list of telecommunication devices participating in concurrent communications. Therefore claim 16 defines over Anderson since the step of performing and displaying a list of participating devices is not present.

Claim 16 also sets forth the step of removing one of the devices by selecting the one device from the list. Applicant has reviewed Anderson, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of selecting one of the devices from a list and then removing that one device by its selection. Claim 16 therefore further defines over Anderson. Applicant notes that Anderson does describe that identities are removed from the list, but there is no step of removing devices participating in a concurrent communication by selecting a participant from the list. Claim 16 therefore further defines over Anderson.

Claim 17 sets forth a packet controller combining packets and displaying information on a display corresponding to an identity of a source of the packets combined. Applicant has reviewed Anderson, and finds no teaching nor suggestion in Anderson of any packet controller which displays information on the identity of combined packets. Since this structure is not present in Anderson, claim 17 also defines over Anderson.

Claim 17 also sets forth that the packet controller allows one of the identities displayed to be selected for dropping claiming a concurrent telephonic communication. Applicant finds

no teaching nor suggestion of any structure in Anderson where an identity of a source can be selected for dropping from a concurrent communication. Since Anderson does not teach nor suggest any such structure, Anderson further cannot anticipate the packet controller of claim 17. Claim 17 therefore further defines over Anderson.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,

By: 

Theobald Dengler
Registration No. 34,575
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:jms
70147.8

DATED: July 22, 2004
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-0827
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.